

A comparative study of numerical methods for the overlap Dirac operator—a status report

J. van den Eshof^{*a}, A. Frommer^b, Th. Lippert^c, K. Schilling^c and H. van der Vorst^a

^aDepartment of Mathematics, University of Utrecht, The Netherlands

^bDepartment of Mathematics, University of Wuppertal, Germany

^cDepartment of Physics, University of Wuppertal, Germany

Improvements of various methods to compute the sign function of the hermitian Wilson-Dirac matrix within the overlap operator are presented. An optimal partial fraction expansion (PFE) based on a theorem of Zolotarev is given. Benchmarks show that this PFE together with removal of converged systems within a multi-shift CG appears to approximate the sign function times a vector most efficiently. A posteriori error bounds are given.

1. INTRODUCTION

The overlap operator, $D = 1 + r\gamma_5 \text{sign}(Q)$, satisfies the Ginsparg-Wilson relation and thus exhibits chiral symmetry at finite lattice spacing a (see [1] and references therein). However, due to the sign function of the hermitian Wilson-Dirac operator, Q , its numerical evaluation is extremely costly, with an overhead estimated to be at least a factor $\mathcal{O}(100)$ compared to Wilson fermions.

In this status report of our ongoing interdisciplinary project, we demonstrate that well established methods to compute the sign function like Lanczos and multi-shift CG in combination with a partial fraction expansion (PFE/CG) can be improved substantially. We present benchmarks of Neuberger's PFE/CG method [1], an optimal PFE/CG method with reduced number of poles, a PFE-improved version of Boriçi's Lanczos process for Q^2 [3], as well as the standard Chebyshev approximation. It turns out that the PFE/CG method with removal of converged systems is most efficient.

Furthermore, for error monitoring and termination of iterations, we derive *a posteriori* error bounds of the approximation of the sign function for both Lanczos (in terms of the residual of a related CG-process) and PFE methods (in terms

of the residuals in the multi-shift solver).

2. NUMERICAL PROBLEMS

Computations involving the overlap operator, D , are characterized by two nested iterations, (i) the outer iterative solution of

$$Dx = (1 + r\gamma_5 \text{sign}(Q))x = b \quad |r| \leq 1, \quad (1)$$

requiring (ii) an inner iteration for s

$$s = \text{sign}(Q)b \quad (2)$$

in each outer iteration step.

Despite the fact that nested schemes are sub-optimal as information built-up for the sign function is discarded after each iteration, they might still be superior to alternatives from [1].

3. NUMERICAL METHODS FOR Sx

3.1. Polynomial approximations for $t^{-\frac{1}{2}}$

These methods determine polynomials p_k which approximate $t^{-\frac{1}{2}}$ on $[a^2, b^2]$ with $a \leq |\lambda_{\min}|$ and $b \geq |\lambda_{\max}|$, the extremal eigenvalues of Q . The approximation to $s = \text{sign}(Q)b$ is then $s \approx Q p_k(Q^2)b$. Polynomials that have been used are *Chebyshev polynomials* with linear convergence (error $\propto (\frac{\kappa-1}{\kappa+1})^k$, κ being the condition number of Q), *Legendre polynomials* as applied in Ref. [4], *Gegenbauer polynomials* as introduced by Bunk (Ref. [5]) and *Schulz polynomials* (error

^{*}Partly supported by EC grant HPRN-CT-2000-00145 Hadrons/Lattice QCD.

$\propto (\frac{\kappa-1}{\kappa+1})^{k\frac{2}{3}}$ which will be presented in a forthcoming publication of our collaboration.

3.2. Lanczos based methods

The Lanczos process in matrix form reads

$$Q V_k = V_k T_k + \beta_{k+1} v_{k+1} e_k^T, \text{ with } V_k^\dagger b = e_1, \quad (3)$$

where we assume $\|b\| = 1$. We refer to eq. (3) as ‘‘Lanczos for Q ’’. Two ways have been proposed to approximate $\text{sign}(Q)b$ by diagonalization of T_k :

$$\text{sign}(Q)b \approx Q V_k (T_k^2)^{-\frac{1}{2}} e_1. \quad ([2]) \quad (4)$$

$$\text{sign}(Q)b \approx V_k \text{sign}(T_k) e_1. \quad ([6]) \quad (5)$$

The errors of both methods are highly oscillating as a function of k . For the second one, the peaks are bounded, however. In order to avoid such oscillations Boriçi has introduced an alternative based on a Lanczos process on Q^2 [3]:

$$Q^2 V_k = V_k T_k + \beta_{k+1} v_{k+1} e_k^T, \text{ with } V_k^\dagger b = e_1. \quad (6)$$

$$\text{sign}(Q)b \approx Q V_k T_k^{-\frac{1}{2}} e_1. \quad (7)$$

The latter method (‘‘Lanczos for Q^2 ’’) shows a smoother convergence rate as well as a potentially smaller projected system T_k . However, in any case the spectral decomposition of T_k is computationally very costly.

3.3. Partial Fraction Expansion and multi-shift CG (PFE/CG)

The elegant idea to use a fixed number of vectors by means of partial fractions expansions has been proposed by Neuberger [1]:

$$\text{sign}(Q)b \approx x^{\text{PFE}} = \sum_{i=1}^m \frac{\omega_i Q}{Q^2 + \tau_i} b \approx x_k = \sum_{i=1}^m \omega_i Q x_k^i. \quad (8)$$

The m vectors x_k^i are computed in step k of the multi-shift CG method [7] for the shifts τ_i .

Two rational approximations so far have been applied in the context of the overlap operator:

Neuberger’s proposal ([1]): The coefficients are defined by

$$\begin{aligned} \tau_i &= \tan^2 \left(\frac{\pi}{2m} \left(i - \frac{1}{2} \right) \right) \\ \omega_i &= \frac{1}{m} \cos^{-2} \left(\frac{\pi}{2m} \left(i - \frac{1}{2} \right) \right). \end{aligned} \quad (9)$$

In general, a large number m of poles τ_i is required to achieve practical precisions.

Remez algorithm (Edwards et al. [8]): By use of the Remez algorithm, an optimal approximation $g(x)$ to $x^{-\frac{1}{2}}$ in $\|\cdot\|_{\infty}^{[\lambda_{\min}^2, \lambda_{\max}^2]}$ is constructed, resulting in a substantially smaller number of poles. However, the sign function is approximated as $x g(x^2)$ which is *not* the $\|\cdot\|_{\infty}$ -optimal approximation to $\text{sign}(x)$ in $[-|\lambda_{\max}|, -|\lambda_{\min}|] \cup [|\lambda_{\min}|, |\lambda_{\max}|]$.

4. IMPROVEMENTS

4.1. Lanczos procedures

As mentioned, the Lanczos approach might be slow since a diagonalization of T_k is required. As far as the ‘‘Lanczos on Q^2 ’’ approach is concerned we propose to use a PFE, as detailed next, to compute a first approximation to the inverse square root of the *full matrix* (T_k). Based on this approximation, the Lanczos procedure is repeated to yield the final approximation to $(Q^2)^{-\frac{1}{2}} b$.

4.2. PFE/CG

The vector updates in PFE/CG play a significant role for large numbers of poles for practical implementations. Therefore, we seek for a reduction of the number of poles to improve PFE/CG. In contrast to Ref. [8] we try to find a rational function $f(x)$ that minimizes

$$\|1 - \sqrt{x} f(x)\|_{\infty}^{[\lambda_{\min}^2, \lambda_{\max}^2]}. \quad (10)$$

Then $x f(x^2)$ is the $\|\cdot\|_{\infty}$ -optimal rational approximation of the sign function on $[-|\lambda_{\max}|, -|\lambda_{\min}|] \cup [|\lambda_{\min}|, |\lambda_{\max}|]$. By means of Zolotarev’s theorem [9] $f(x)$ can be given in analytic form:

$$f(x) = D \frac{\prod_{l=1}^{k-1} (x + c_{2l})}{\prod_{l=1}^k (x + c_{2l-1})}, \quad (11)$$

where the coefficients can be expressed in terms of Jacobian elliptic functions:

$$c_l = \frac{\text{sn}^2(lK/2k; \kappa)}{1 - \text{sn}^2(lK/2k; \kappa)}, \quad l = 1, \dots, 2k-1, \quad (12)$$

with $\sqrt{1 - \kappa^2} = |\frac{\lambda_{\min}}{\lambda_{\max}}|$ and D being uniquely determined by the condition

$$\max_{C[1, (\frac{\lambda_{\max}}{\lambda_{\min}})^2]} [1 - \sqrt{x} f(x)] = - \min_{C[1, (\frac{\lambda_{\max}}{\lambda_{\min}})^2]} [1 - \sqrt{x} f(x)].$$

Table 1 shows that the method drastically reduces the number of poles, in particular for large condition numbers.

Table 1
Number of poles for precision 0.01.

$\frac{\lambda_{\max}}{\lambda_{\min}}$	Neuberger	Remez [8]	Zolotarev
200	19	7	5
1000	42	12	6
100000	> 500	?	10

Another interesting idea is to remove converged systems from the multi-shift process early, as residuals for shifted matrices with large shifts τ_i reduce more quickly. Under some restrictions on the quality of PFE we can show that for a total error of at most ϵ we can stop updating system j after step k as soon as

$$\|r_k^j\| \leq \frac{\epsilon}{m} \frac{\sqrt{\tau_j}}{\omega_j}. \quad (13)$$

5. A POSTERIORI ERROR BOUNDS

The error in the PFE/CG method is composed of 2 parts. For a total error of at most ϵ we demand:

$$\text{I. } |\text{sign}(\lambda) - \sum_{i=1}^m \omega_i \frac{\lambda}{\lambda^2 + \tau_i}| \leq \epsilon/2, \quad (14)$$

$$\text{II. } \|x^{\text{PFE}} - x_k\| \leq \epsilon/2. \quad (15)$$

One can prove that the total error $\leq \epsilon$, if the CG residual for the smallest shift satisfies

$$\|r_k^1\| \leq \frac{\epsilon}{2 + \epsilon}. \quad (16)$$

For “Lanczos for Q^2 ” it is worth noting that we also managed to get a posteriori error bounds which will be presented in a forthcoming paper.

6. NUMERICAL EXPERIMENTS

Our tests have been carried out on quenched 16^4 configurations at $\beta = 6.0$ and $m = -1.6$ with the error for the approximation of the sign function being $< 10^{-10}$. The timings are from 16 nodes of the Wuppertal cluster computer ALiCE.

Table 2
Benchmarks.

confs	1	2	3	4	5
$ \lambda_{\min} \cdot 10^3$	0.455	1.39	1.17	2.23	3.02
$ \lambda_{\max} $	2.48	2.48	2.48	2.48	2.48
poles Neub.	143	82	89	65	56
poles Zolo.	21	18	19	17	16
Chebyshev					
MVs	9501	3501	4001	2301	2201
time/s	655	247	278	160	154
Lanczos/PFE					
MVs	2281	1969	1953	1853	1769
time/s	150	131	129	124	118
PFE/CG Neuberger					
MVs	?	985	977	929	887
time/s	?	340	362	274	215
PFE/CG Zolotarev without removal					
MVs	1141	985	977	927	885
time/s	154	125	125	116	102
PFE/CG Zolotarev + removal					
MVs	1205	1033	1033	971	927
time/s	122	93	97	87	79

7. OUTLOOK

The benchmark results demonstrate that the PFE/CG/Zolotarev procedure with removing of converged systems turns out to be most effective.

As a next step, we will tune the accuracy of the sign approximation within the solution of the outer problem, $Dx = b$ (eq. (1)). Furthermore, we will investigate the effect of projecting out some low eigenvalues of Q onto our findings.

REFERENCES

1. H. Neuberger. In Frommer et al. [10], p. 1.
2. A. Boriçi. *Phys. Lett.*, B453:46, 1999.
3. A. Boriçi. In Frommer et al. [10], p. 40.
4. P. Hernandez et al. *Nucl. Phys.*, B552:363, 1999.
5. B. Bunk. *Nucl. Phys. Proc. Suppl.*, B63:952, 1998.
6. H. A. van der Vorst. In [10], p. 18.
7. U. Glässner et al. *Int. J. Mod. Phys.*, C7:635, 1996.
8. R. G. Edwards et al. *Nucl. Phys.*, B540:457, 1999.
9. D. Ingerman et al. *Comm. Pure Appl. Math.*, 53(8):1039, 2000.
10. A. Frommer et al. (eds.) *Numerical Challenges in Lattice Quantum Chromodynamics*, Springer Verlag, Heidelberg, 2000.